



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/840,224 | 05/07/2004 | Stephen Mark Mueller | P24943 (LB1042) | 9675 |
| 7055 | 7590 | 11/08/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191 | | | | NGUYEN, QUYNH H |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2614 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 11/08/2007 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/840,224 | MUELLER ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Quynh H. Nguyen | 2614 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Remarks filed 8/29/07.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 8/27/07 has been entered. No claims have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Claims 1-20 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-9, and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karves et al. (US Patent 7,085,257) in view of Barchi (US Patent 7,187,932).

As to claims 1, 8, 14, and 19, Karves et al. teaches the steps of:
receiving, a network service platform (Fig. 1; col. 8, lines 11-24) a calling party number in response to a telephone call from the calling party number (col. 3, lines 58-60; col. 9, lines 19-20 and lines 43-45);
querying a central personal address book (Fig. 8, *network phonebook*) using the calling party number (col. 3, lines 61-63; col. 9, lines 35-39), to retrieve personal caller identification information associated with the calling party number and displayable to the user (col. 3, lines 62-66; col. 9, lines 47-48; col. 12, lines 2-7); and

forwarding the network caller identification information supplemented with the personal caller identification information when connecting the telephone call to the user (col. 3, lines 64-66; col. 9, lines 57-66 - *where Karves discussed the caller ID information presented at the user terminal include profile information such as business card information including position in a client firm or company, background information along with the caller name identification, hence forwarding supplemented information with the caller ID information*).

Karves et al. does not explicitly teach the personal caller identification loadable by the user to the central, network based personal address book.

Barchi teaches teach the personal caller identification loadable by the user to the central, network based personal address book (Fig. 8; col. col. 7, lines 14-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Barchi into the teachings of Karves in order to have a more efficient system and allowing network subscriber to access and update his or her contact data while mobile or traveling, as discussed by Barchi (col. 1, lines 29-35).

As to claims 2 and 9, Karves et al. teaches the caller ID information presented at the user terminal (col. 9, lines 64-65), hence determining when a telephone call is being placed to the user because the caller ID always has time stamped of when the call comes in.

As to claims 3, 11, and 15, Karves et al. teaches querying a network caller identification database, using the calling party number (col. 3, lines 61-63; col. 9, lines

Art Unit: 2614

35-37), to retrieve the network caller identification information (col. 3, lines 62-66; col. 9, lines 47-49).

As to claims 4, 12, and 20, Karves et al. teaches the telecommunications network comprises one of a voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) network (col. 8, lines 40-43; col. 9, lines 10-13), a wireless network (col. 8, lines 11-16), and a public switched telephone network (col. 9, lines 14-16).

As to claims 5, 13, and 16, Karves et al. teaches logging each telephone call to the user as an entry comprising at least one of the personal caller identification information, date, time, and calling party telephone number (col. 12, lines 41-45).

As to claims 6-7 and 17-18, Karves et al. teaches accessing phonebook/network database via Web browser (col. 11, lines 1-17), or via user terminal (col. 13, lines 1-3); and modifying of the journal database (col. 14, lines 8-18). Hence, it is inherently one can add / modify entry to the address book during a web browsing session.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karves et al. (US Patent 7,085,257) in view of Barchi (US Patent 7,187,932) and further in view of Birch et al. (US 2004/0120473).

As to claims 10, Karves and Barchi do not teach the network service platform comprises one of a SCP, SIP feature server, and Parlay gateway.

Birch et al. teaches the network service platform comprises one of a SCP, SIP feature server, and Parlay gateway (page 2, [0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Birch into the teachings of Karves and Barchi for the purpose of having a variety of network platform for better support the system.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Barchi does not teach the first three limitations of claim 1, and Karves does not teach that users can enter information into a network phonebook (Remarks, pages 3-4). Examiner respectfully submits that the primary reference Karves teaches the first three limitations of claim 1. The secondary reference Barchi is cited to fill the missing feature of the personal caller identification loadable by the user to the central, network based personal address book (Fig. 8; col. col. 7, lines 14-40). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that in order to maintain any database, one can always update or make changes to the database.

Applicant mainly argues that in Barchi, why one would query both network and local databases if they are the same (Remarks, page 3). Examiner respectfully submits that mobile communications is constantly moving around, hence central network-based personal address book permits subscriber to access and revise contact data while mobile. Especially when the subscriber is not near communication device where local address book is stored, the subscriber can query the network one. The advantage of

having central network database is old and well known. For example, maintaining and updating a central network database vs. plurality of local databases.

Applicant argues that Karves does not teach forwarding network caller ID information supplemented with the personal caller ID information (Remarks, pages 4-5). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Karves teaches the caller ID information presented at the user terminal include background information along with the caller name identification (col. 9, lines 57-66), hence forwarding supplemented information with the caller ID information.

Applicant argues Birch does not teach limitations of claims that claim 10 depends on, and there is no motivation to combine Birch with Karves and Barchi. Examiner respectfully submits that Karves, Barchi, and Birch dealing with telephony communications. For example, call initiation, routing, caller ID, etc. are features in telecommunications. The Karves and Barchi references relates to network phonebook databases and caller ID system. The Birch reference is cited to fill in the missing feature of SCP, SIP feature server, and Parlay gateway. The combination of the references teaches the claims invention.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2614

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


QUYNH H. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER